REMARKS

Claims 58-77 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 58, 61-77 have been amended, and claims 59 and 60 have been cancelled, as shown on pp. 3-7 of the Reply. In addition, the specification has been amended as indicated on p. 2.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 58-77 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 58-77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the amendments made to independent claims 58, 69, and 77.

II. Rejection of Claims 58-77 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 58-77 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilf (US 2001/0049826 – hereinafter Wilf) in view of Cragun, *et al.* (US 5,481,296 – hereinafter Cragun). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Wilf and Cragun, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all the limitations recited in the subject claims.

The claimed subject matter discloses systems and methods to facilitate identifying information of relevance to received audio, visual, and/or closed captioned data (a multi-media data stream). The audio, visual, or closed captioned data can be converted to a format allowing keywords to be determined. Keyword searches can be conducted to identify information relevant to the received data. For example, a video and accompanying closed captioned data can be converted to keywords enabling found URL's of relevant documents/web pages to be presented to the user concurrent with the video and closed captioned data, thereby allowing a user to select web pages containing information related to the video/closed captioned presentation. The audio, visual, closed captioned data can be received at a client device, from a remotely located broadcast server, *via* the internet. The received data can be analyzed on the client device and any relevant documents/web pages presented to the user at a client device, per the discussion above.

Independent claim 58, as amended, recites in part:...***A user device for providing***

supplemental information to a multi-media data stream, the device comprising:…a receiver component configured to receive a multi-media data stream; a decoding component configured to decode the received multi-media data stream and convert the data stream to a format suitable for a keyword generation component; a keyword generation component that generates search terms from the converted data stream; wherein the user device is configured to: receive a multi-media data stream via the receiver component; output the multi-media data stream for display to a user on an output device; decode the multi-media data stream and convert the data stream to a format suitable for a keyword generation component via the decoding component; generate keywords corresponding to the converted data stream; obtain search results based on the generated keywords; and output the search results for display to the user on the output device concurrent with the output of the multi-media data stream. Wilf and Cragun, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest such distinctive features of the claimed subject matter.

Rather, Wilf relates to presenting a user with various programs that match user-selected criteria. As opposed to the traditional method of reviewing a pre-printed TV guide or an on-screen list of current/upcoming shows, a user can enter keywords and images that relate to a specific subject matter of interest to them. The audio-visual content of the programs currently on each of the various TV channels can be analyzed and compared with the user selected criteria. If a TV show is determined to have content matching the selection criteria the user can be prompted that a TV show of interest is currently available on channel x and, if the user desires, the TV can be switched to channel x.

However, unlike the claimed subject matter, Wilf is silent regarding receiving the broadcast communications at a user device and conducting the subsequent decoding, keyword and search generation, and presentation of found information on the user device. With Wilf, an interface is presented to the user on the client side thereby allowing the user to enter required search information, but all of the broadcast decoding and analysis, *etc.*, is performed on the server side of the network. (*See* [0089], [0103] and [0104]).

Cragun relates to a closed captioning decoder extracting text streams from a television and comparing the text streams with user configured search terms to determine whether a particular program(s) is of interest to the user. However, Cragun is silent with regard to

disclosing a client based system. As discussed above, Wilf fails to disclose each and every element of the claimed subject matter and Cragun fails to make up for the deficiencies of Wilf.

Independent claim 69, as amended, recites in part:...***receiving a multi-media data communication from at least one remotely located server...performing a search to yield results utilizing the search terms, the search results are uniform resource locators (URLs) of web pages containing information relevant to the search; and displaying on a display device the search results to a user concurrently with outputting the at least one of corresponding broadcasting image data, broadcasting audio data, or closed captioning data***. Wilf and Cragun, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest such distinctive features of the claimed subject matter.

Independent claim 69 includes the feature of ***uniform resource locators (URLs) of web pages containing information relevant to the search*** which has been previously presented in claim 65. In the subject Office Action (*see* Office Action, 01/23/2009 - pg. 13), with regard to claim 65, it is contended that Wilf discloses the presentation of URL's (*see* [0011] and [0102]). Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees. The URL's disclosed in [0011] are merely presented as part of an overview of how the internet operates with documents being identified and retrieved by their associated URL. Further, the URL mentioned in [0102] relates to changing a URL set in a tuner to allow the tuner to switch from one Web-TV set-top box to another, where each URL identifies a particular Web-TV set-top box. Wilf is silent with regard to presenting a user with ***uniform resource locators (URLs) of web pages containing information relevant to the search*** related to the currently displayed video. Claim 65, which depends from independent claim 58, recites a similar feature of ***the results comprise uniform resource locators (URLs)***.

Further, independent claim 69 includes the feature of ***receiving a multi-media data communication from at least one remotely located server***. As discussed with regard to independent claim 58, Wilf and Cragun are silent with regard to such claimed feature. With Wilf, an interface is presented to the user on the client side thereby allowing the user to enter required search information, but all of the broadcast decoding and analysis, *etc.*, is performed on the server side of the network. Cragun fails to make up for the deficiencies of Wilf in failing to disclose each and every element of the claimed subject matter.

Turning to independent claim 77, as amended, recites in part:… ***means for receiving at a client device, from at least one remotely located server, at least one of a communication broadcasting image data, broadcasting audio data, or closed captioning data; the client device further comprising:… means for decoding data… means for determining search terms… means for performing a search to yield results utilizing the search terms, the results are uniform resource locators (URLs) of web pages containing information relevant to the search; and means for displaying the results of the search to a user concurrently with outputting the corresponding broadcasting image, audio and closed captioning data***. Wilf and Cragun, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest such distinctive features of the claimed subject matter.

As discussed above regarding independent claim 58, Wilf and Cragun are silent with regard to a single device comprising of the various components required to receive the communication data, process the data and present search results concurrent with the communication data. With Wilf, the user enters search criteria *via* an interface located on the client device but the video decoding and search/query is performed at the content-based search server. (*See* [0056], [0079], and [0089]). Further, as discussed *supra* with regard to independent claim 69, Wilf and Cragun are silent with regard to the search results being URLs of web pages containing information of relevance to the corresponding data broadcast.

In view of at least the foregoing, Wilf and Cragun, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element as recited in independent claims 58, 69, and 77 (and their associated dependent claims). Accordingly, it is believed that the subject claims are in condition for allowance, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP122USA].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

TUROCY & WATSON, LLP

/Thomas E. Watson/
Thomas E. Watson
Reg. No. 43,243

TUROCY & WATSON, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731